

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

CHRISTOPHER SCOTT DANGIM,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 1:23-cv-00131-KWR-LF

ALBUQUERQUE POLICE DEPARTMENT, *et al*,

Defendants.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

THIS MATTER is before the Court following Plaintiff's failure to address deficiencies in his Civil Rights Complaint (Doc. 1) (Complaint). Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. The Complaint purports to raise 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims for racial profiling, false arrest, and entrapment. *See* Doc. 1 at 5. The facts supporting the claims are partially illegible, and it is unclear how each Defendant is involved in any wrongdoing. By an Order entered February 13, 2023, the Court directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint with legible handwriting. *See* Doc. 5. The Order also set out the minimum pleading standards under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The Order advised that "to state a claim in federal court, a complaint must explain what each defendant did to him or her; when the defendant did it; how the defendant's action harmed him or her; and, what specific legal right the plaintiff believes the defendant violated." *Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents, at Arapahoe County Justice Center*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007) (describing the Rule 8 standard in *pro se* cases). The Clerk's Office mailed Plaintiff a blank civil rights complaint, to assist with the amendment. Plaintiff was warned that the failure to timely file a legible amended complaint that complies with the Order may result in dismissal without further notice.

The deadline to comply was March 6, 2023. Plaintiff did not return a completed civil rights complaint as directed. Instead, he filed a page and a half containing several handwritten lines. *See Doc. 6.* In the pages, Plaintiff lists several bare causes of action with no factual detail; demands a settlement for \$1 million; and requests a jury trial if the “motion to settle” is not granted. *Id.* The filing does not comply with the minimum pleading standards set out in *Nasious* and the prior Order to Cure Deficiencies. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the Complaint without prejudice for “failure to prosecute[;] comply with the … court’s orders;” and comply with Rule 8(a). *Olsen v. Mapes*, 333 F.3d 1199, 1204 n. 3 (10th Cir. 2003) (addressing Rule 41). *See also Fontana v. Pearson*, 772 Fed. App’x 728, 729 (10th Cir. 2019) (“If the complainant fails to comply with Rule 8, a court may dismiss an action with or without prejudice.”). The Court will also deny Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, which is now moot.

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Civil Rights Complaint (**Doc. 1**) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**; the Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (**Doc. 2**) is **DENIED AS MOOT**; and the Court will enter a separate Judgment disposing of this civil case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



KEA W. RIGGS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE